United Nations A/55/463

General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 October 2000

Original: English

Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 15 (a)
Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs: election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council

Letter dated 9 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly

Africa's candidature to the Security Council

I have the honour to write to you once again on this important subject. This is a follow-up to my earlier letter to you dated 4 October 2000 (see annex I).

The issues are that there was no consensus in Lomé concerning the Sudan's candidature, as evidenced by President Museveni's strong objections contained in his statement to the summit (see annex II). Any claim, therefore, verbal or written, that there was an endorsement by the Organization of African Unity is false because of the unequivocal objections by President Museveni.

Hence, Uganda maintains that in the absence of a consensus, it is utterly wrong to speak of an endorsed candidate. That means that the election is open to competition. In this particular case there are two candidates: Mauritius and the Sudan.

In order to remove any doubt or ambiguity about the dispute of the alleged official endorsement of the Sudan, I should be most grateful if you would publish as a document of the General Assembly President Museveni's statement to the Lomé summit as well as the present letter, both of which are clear evidence of the absence of a consensus.

(*Signed*) Matia Mulumba **Semakula Kiwanuka**
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations

00-68046 (E) 091000

Annex I to the letter dated 9 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly

Sudan's candidature to the Security Council

I have the honour to send you Uganda's official objection to Sudan's candidature.

Because there is misleading information that is being circulated regarding Sudan's candidature, my Government has instructed me to have President Museveni's objections published as a Security Council document, and it has been published as S/2000/933 dated 29 September 2000.

No endorsement

President Museveni's objections are Uganda's official challenge, and they are **absolutely clear** that there was no endorsement for the Sudan or for any other candidate in Lomé. This is contrary to the information conveyed to you by a letter from Ambassador Jagne of the Gambia regarding the candidature of the Sudan.

I should be grateful if you would recognize President Museveni's statement not only as Uganda's official objection to the Sudan, but also as clear evidence that Africa has no endorsed candidate due to lack of a consensus. You are requested to act accordingly.

(*Signed*) Matia Mulumba **Semakula Kiwanuka**
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations

Annex II to the letter dated 9 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly*

Statement made by His Excellency Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, President of the Republic of Uganda on the candidature of the Sudan for a seat on the Security Council, Lomé, 11 July 2000

Position of Uganda on the candidature of the Sudan for the United Nations Security Council seat

1. As indicated at the closed session of yesterday, Uganda objects to the candidature of the Sudan to represent our region in the United Nations Security Council. Below are Uganda's reasons for that objection.

2. The group of members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in New York have, over the years, evolved a procedure for the selection of African representation in various United Nations bodies. The procedure is as follows:

(a) An interested country presents its candidature to the African Group of Ambassadors;

(b) The Group of Ambassadors normally refers such an application to a smaller committee, consisting of about 10 countries. This committee is known as the Candidatures Committee;

(c) The Candidatures Committee selects a suitable African applicant for the particular post and refers the matter back to the Group of Ambassadors, which then undertakes to designate the particular candidate as the selected sole African candidate;

(d) A rule of thumb, which over the years has evolved into a respected practice, is that where there are many applicants, a rotational system is adopted. Under this system, a country that served on the particular body, in this case the Security Council, furthest back would automatically be designated. In the case of the Security Council seat, the Sudan last served in 1972-1973, Mauritius in 1974-1975, the United Republic of Tanzania in 1975-1976 and Uganda in 1981-1982;

(e) This process, however, does not end in New York. The African Group in New York seeks the formal support of the entire OAU by recommending the particular candidate of the OAU General Secretariat through the African Group in Addis Ababa, where a similar Group of Ambassadors exists. This Group has its own rule which requires that a particular candidate be presented to it three months prior to the election to the post. The Ambassadors then make recommendations to the OAU Council of Ministers through its Ministerial Committee on Candidatures. The Council then decides the matter on the basis of the Committee's recommendations.

* Previously issued as S/2000/933, annex.

Sequence of events with respect to the candidature of the Sudan

3. With respect to the Security Council seat, African representation in the non-permanent seat is on a rotational basis among the five regions in Africa, namely, southern Africa, eastern Africa, Central Africa, West Africa and North Africa.

4. The current seat for which the Sudan is vying is due to be filled by a candidate from eastern Africa which consists of Uganda, Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Comoros, Seychelles and Mauritius. Another rule of thumb here is that this particular group is responsible for the selection from among its members of a candidate who will then be forwarded to the larger African Group for endorsement. The coordinator of the eastern African Group did not undertake this consultation. At a brief meeting of OAU Ambassadors with the Under-Secretary-General — Adviser for Special Assignments in Africa, the Ambassador of the Sudan suddenly announced his country's candidature. Uganda objected to this proposal and was supported by Nigeria and the Niger.

5. In a separate development, Mauritius, which had also been vying for the seat, informed the OAU General Secretariat through the African Group of its intention to run for the Security Council seat. Mauritius followed the OAU procedure of submitting an application three months prior to a particular election. The Sudan, on the other hand, never made any submission to OAU. It is for this reason that the Sudan does not appear on the current agenda of the OAU Ministerial Committee on Candidatures — it did not comply with the procedures laid down in Addis Ababa. Here in Lomé, the Ministerial Committee deliberated on this matter on 9 July 2000 but never completed its work and has not, to date, reported to the Council. Mauritius informed the Committee that because of this lack of consensus it intended to take this matter to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government.

6. An important point to remember is that the Sudan is still under Security Council sanctions (resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996)). It would not be wise for the OAU to propose as its representative on the Security Council a country that is still under sanctions by that same Council.

7. The matter of sanctions against the Sudan is due to be discussed sometime in November 2000 but the election of new non-permanent members to the Security Council will be held earlier, in October. The Sudan should be advised to defer its candidature in favour of Mauritius until 2001, in the hope that, by that time, the sanctions against it will have been lifted.

8. It appears that there was not sufficient consultation in the Eastern African Group. If this had been done, I am certain the group would have pointed out the weakness in the application of the Sudan and it would not have been elected to represent our region. This explains why the candidature of the Sudan was sponsored by countries outside the Eastern African Group because the Sudan knew that our regional group would not give the candidature its blessing. The so-called rotational rule only applies in a situation where there are no other reasons against a particular candidate. Otherwise, a particular candidate must have a clean record before the automatic rotational procedure can be successfully applied.

* * *

9. Apart from the reasons of procedure and United Nations sanctions, Uganda objects to the candidature of the Sudan because of the incredible criminal terrorism

that the Sudan has been, either directly or by proxy, perpetrating on Uganda in the form of kidnapping of children, most of whom are used as sex slaves and infected with AIDS, burning them alive as happened at Kichwamba Technical Institute, etc. We have complained to various agencies of the United Nations, including the United Nations Children's Fund, about all this, to no avail. Uganda is coping and will, eventually, defeat this terrorism.

10. Uganda cannot, therefore, give backing to Sudan in the light of these incredible acts even if it did not go into other moral questions that are internal to Sudan.